

CHILD STUDY

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL
of PARENT EDUCATION

SUMMER, 1946

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial - - - - -	102
Jealousy and Rivalry Between Brothers and Sisters -	103
Mary O'Neil Hawkins, M.D.	
Shall We Divide Ourselves? - - - - -	106
Terry Spitalny	
Rivalry in School—The Teacher's Problem - - - - -	108
Rhoda Harris	
Adolescent Rivalries - - - - -	110
Ruth Brickner, M.D.	
Parents' Questions and Discussion - - - - -	113
Suggestions for Study: Jealousy and Rivalry in Children - - - - -	114
Science Contributes:	
The Psychological Test—Panacea or Myth? - - - - -	116
Morris Krugman	
New Light on Heredity—Adult Adjustment of Foster Home Children - - - - -	119
Anne Roe	
A Mother Contributes - - - - -	121
Book Review - - - - -	122
Children's Books - - - - -	123
Children's Radio Programs - - - - -	124
News and Notes - - - - -	125
FORTY-FIVE CENTS A COPY	VOL. XXIII, NO. 4
	\$1.50 A YEAR

HEADLINES



Parents and teachers are constantly faced with expressions of jealousy and rivalry in children. The feelings underlying this behavior are normal and are found in all children. Adults who understand this can help children to express these feelings in ways which will not damage personality development and human relationships.



Contributors to this issue include: Ruth Brickner, M.D., psychiatrist, formerly a member of the Family Counseling Service of the Child Study Association of America; Rhoda Harris, for many years a teacher at the Little Red School House in New York City, now director of the Albany Academy for Girls; Mary O'Neil Hawkins, M.D., practicing psychoanalyst in New York City; Morris Krugman, Ph.D., chief psychologist of the Bureau of Child Guidance, Board of Education of the City of New York; Anne Roe, of the Laboratory of Applied Physiology, Section on Alcohol Studies, Yale University; and Terry Spitalny, formerly a teacher at the Walden School in New York City, and now on the staff of the Family Counseling Service of Child Study Association.



EDITORIAL BOARD

RUTH MALLAY, *Editor*
SIDONIE MATSNER GRIENBERG
ALINE B. AUERBACH
PAULINE RUSKE FADIMAN
JOSETTE FRANK

HELEN G. STERNAU
ANNA W. M. WOLF

CHARLOTTE WILLIAMS
Managing Editor

CHILD STUDY reentered as second class matter December 6, 1939, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1946, by Child Study Association of America, Inc. Published by the Child Study Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y. Quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer issues; published in November, February, April and June. 45 cents a copy, \$1.50 a year. Add 25¢ for all foreign subscriptions.



EDITORIAL

THE growing child seeks approval and affection from those who give him protection and security. He seeks also self-assurance as to his worth and competence. For these he must measure himself first against his siblings and then against his contemporaries. Feelings of rivalry and jealousy are unavoidable. When he and his rival have the same desires, whether it is for something material or for the attention and favor of others, competitive striving is normal. We have to direct these complex emotions constructively.

THE importance of competition varies among cultures and it varies in the course of the individual's development. In our nation's pioneer period, when each individual or family had to stand pretty much alone, competition stimulated the maximum of effort and ingenuity. In emergencies, neighbors would exchange services or they would join forces against common enemies or dangers. There was little continuous interdependence, and competition came to be regarded as a primary and permanent virtue.

INCREASINGLY, however, division of labor makes us dependent upon one another; it becomes more imperative for us to cooperate and coordinate. Emphasizing traditions of competition in the training of children handicaps them as they grow into a world that can survive only through joint operations.

AS we take individual variations into account, many kinds of competition become irrelevant for the individual as well as for the school or the community. We cannot pretend to children that each one of them could outdo any others—if he only tried hard enough. On the other hand, the reaction against competition because of the ruthlessness which often accompanies it, may have gone too far. Yet we cannot expect children to develop either the attitudes or the skills of cooperation by merely ignoring or disparaging their misdirected rivalries.

PARENTS and teachers must help each child to discover that he can gain recognition without constantly attempting to do what is for him impossible. They must help him to find what his special qualities are and how to make the most of them. It need not be a question of encouraging either competition or cooperation. The need everywhere is increasingly for cooperation in larger and larger groups and in more and more different ways. The challenge to modern education is to guide the child's emotional need to express himself, and to gain recognition in ways that help the individual toward his own fullest development and at the same time his greatest usefulness to his immediate group—and eventually to the larger society.

THE EDITORS.

Jealousy and Rivalry Between Brothers and Sisters*

MARY O'NEIL HAWKINS, M.D.

JEALOUSY and rivalry between brothers and sisters again and again disturb the happiness and peace of the home. In the school, too, overt or hidden antagonisms among the pupils—antagonisms originally engendered within the family—frequently disrupt the most carefully planned school projects. The old problems of Joseph and his brethren (and sisters) always concern the child study specialists. The importance for character development of early sibling relationships is discovered anew in every psychoanalytic case study.

Jealousy and rivalry exist in all adults and in all children. Every form of jealousy originates in love jealousy. The child is jealous because his parents love one another and because they love the other children. In like manner, every type of rivalry originates in love rivalry. The child competes with all the other members of his family to obtain the exclusive love of each parent. Although during childhood and adolescence jealousy and rivalry undergo many changes of expression, their foundation remains the young child's wish to be the beloved, *the one and only beloved*, of his mother and father.

Most parents do not appreciate the intensity of this desire. Some parents become angered by any evidence of jealousy and punish its expression in the child; others go to the opposite extreme in trying to eliminate causes of jealousy. They buy all the children new clothes, whether needed or not, at the same time; never compliment one child without the other; give every present in duplicate or triplicate, and so on. Neither method is good. Punishment cannot eradicate nor can equality of gifts and compliments prevent the desire for exclusive affection.

Nor, since exclusive affection is something the child never possesses, can jealousy and rivalry be eliminated. However, the extent and intensity of these feelings may be kept within normal limits if parents understand what situations produce jealousy and how their own attitudes stimulate it. A few of

the manifold causes of jealousy and a few of the complex expressions of rivalry have been selected for discussion.

Perhaps the most important determinant of jealousy is the child's realization of the relationship between his parents—of his father's attitude toward his mother and his mother's attitude toward his father. The child is always jealous of his parents' affection for each other. If the evidences of this love are too apparent and the child feels himself excluded from it, his jealousy may become intense. He may show this feeling in regard to his parents directly or he may displace it upon his siblings. Thus a child who is deeply jealous of his mother or father may appear to be jealous of his brother or sister.

Although parents should modify behavior which too strongly stimulates their children's jealousy, yet they need not hide all evidences of their love for each other (though some zealots so interpret the explanations of modern psychology). The child finally has to learn that he is not the chosen mate of his mother or father.

Most of you know that the child is jealous when a new baby is born, but I wonder how many of you really feel it. Let me suggest a similar situation. How would you, as a wife, feel if your husband brought a second wife home with him and said, "I thought it was so nice to have one wife that I decided to have another. Don't be jealous—I love you just as much as I ever did. I love you both just the same." What you would *feel* is exactly what the child feels when a baby is born into the family. If you compare your feeling to the child's, you can help him adjust to the arrival of a new baby.

Age differences between children are a constant source of jealousy. The older child is jealous of the younger because he is more protected, seemingly better loved; and the younger child is jealous of the older because he is given more privileges, again seemingly better loved. If jealousy becomes intense, it is usually because the parents have given the age difference an added value. Some parents prefer the

* Presented at a meeting of the Child Study Association of America on January 15, 1946.

helplessness of their younger children, and others prefer the independence of their older children. In either case the child may sense this favoritism and become envious of his siblings.

Sex differences play an important rôle in the development of jealousy. Girls envy boys, and boys envy girls. This envy is determined by many causes. Essential sex characteristics are the most potent factors. The little girl wants to have a male sex organ and the little boy wants to bear babies. The older girl may desire a masculine career and the boy a feminine career. Although these wishes later undergo modifications, nevertheless the essential core may persist—how intensely will be determined by the parents' attitudes.

All parents feel differently about their male and female children. Usually the mother prefers the boy and the father the girl; sometimes, the reverse is true. Marked parental favoritism may strengthen the child's envy of the opposite sex. Fathers and mothers should, however, not reproach themselves for such preferences, since they are universal. (The idea that we love our parents, brothers and sisters, or children equally is only a social fabrication.) Nevertheless, parents should control overt manifestations of favoritism, at least so far as possible.

Numerous other causes of jealousy between siblings have been studied. Besides the inevitable situations described above, various others occur. Great differences in intellectual ability, in athletic prowess, in special talents, in physical appearance may be important determinants. These lead to envy between brothers and sisters, but not to intense envy, if the parents do not overvalue such endowments.

Sometimes a child of mediocre intelligence is intensely jealous of a brilliant sibling and sometimes he is not. If the parents overrate intelligence, he will have great jealousy, but he may escape it if the parents know the relative worth of intellectual ability. His jealousy will not be stimulated if the parents value other qualities besides intellectual ones.

Some parents overemphasize the importance of athletic ability. If they feel (usually the father is at fault) that athletic prowess signifies real masculinity, then a son who dislikes sports will feel inferior and jealous of other siblings who excel him.

The child's physical aspect may have special significance for his parents. Resemblances to loved or unloved members of their own family may attract or repel them. A mother who has felt ashamed of her own appearance may prefer her good-looking child or she may reject him in favor of a plainer one.

Here, again, a child's jealousy may be stimulated.

The causes of jealousy I have described here are all related to the child's desire for the exclusive love of his parents. He resents his parents' affection not only for each other but also for his sisters and brothers. He is shocked by the birth of a new baby. He envies siblings of the opposite sex. He feels rejected by his parents' preference for the special talents of another brother or sister. These are some of the causes of jealousy. Now I should like to discuss its manifestations, manifestations as important and interesting as the causes.

The clearest expression of jealousy occurs in young children when a baby is born in the family. You hear children say such things as, "Send him back," or "I don't want him" or "Throw him out of the window." They attempt even to injure the infant. One mother found her child by the baby's crib trying to push in its eyes and saying over and over, "Muva's ifa teza, Muva's ifa teza" (he had heard the mother call the baby, "Mother's infant treasure").

A young child may express his rivalry with the new baby by acting like a baby himself. He may cry more frequently, demand to be fed or begin again soiling or wetting. A somewhat older child may conceal his hostility toward the baby, even appear to be very fond of it, but may show his feeling in other ways. He may cling to his parents, insist upon constant attention from them and become insatiable in his desires, demanding everything and being satisfied with nothing.

As children grow somewhat older, they show their jealousy by trying to excel one another in all the activities of the nursery, such as learning to dress, tie their shoes and put away their toys. They also begin fighting, quarreling and criticizing one another.

School-age children express their rivalry not only in the home but also in the school. They displace to school companions their jealousy of their siblings. Some children are unhappy unless they receive the highest grades, make the athletic teams, obtain leading rôles in class plays, work on the school paper, get invited to all social events, and the like. Children with such excessive desire for distinction will be disappointed in adult life, since few of them can be Olympic champions, state governors, Hollywood stars or famous novelists. Certainly none will hold all these honors simultaneously.

A frequent manifestation of intense jealousy is the exaggerated desire for popularity. This desire militates against any happiness in life, and renders real

love experiences almost impossible. The wish for popularity is found in girls more often than in boys and is encouraged by the mother rather than by the father. This ambition comes to the fore during high school age and forces many adolescent girls (sometimes boys) to lead anxious, shallow lives. These adolescents have no interests and few friends. They long to be invited to all parties, just because they have to be seen everywhere and accepted, and they try always to be the center of the group. The exaggerated wish to be popular is a distorted expression of the basic desire for love and is expressed thus only when a very jealous child feels himself unloved and unlovable; but popularity, even when attained, is a poor substitute for love.

Intense jealousy, however, does not always express itself in rivalry. It sometimes appears as withdrawal from rivalry. Such withdrawal often explains the poor school work of intelligent children. This mechanism also may explain various inhibitions in social life, increased dependence on others, carelessness in regard to personal appearance and lack of effort on the playing field. The child who feels very guilty about his jealousy may withdraw from all competition. He stops vying with his siblings and finally gives up all effort even at school.

Envy may be expressed by generosity, a fact not usually recognized. A child who feels very guilty about his jealousy may repress it from his consciousness and replace it by consideration and tenderness. This is true especially of the eldest child. Very often the eldest girl becomes the little mother of her brothers and sisters, caring for them and protecting them. This attitude may seem ideal, but in extreme cases can extend in later life to all her friends and even business associates. This girl then, because of extreme self-abnegation, may not achieve success in her career.

Although rivalry is necessary for successful attainment in life, it may also distort character formation. Intense jealousy has many manifestations, as described above: exaggerated competitiveness and withdrawal from competitiveness; generosity and greed for popularity.

Let me tell you about the case of a boy, fifteen years old, who is very jealous of his sister. This boy, James, seemed to get along well until his fifth year when his sister was born. He then showed his resentment by wetting and refusing to eat. His mother, even though she knew the unwisdom of such measures, began trying to force him to eat and

to discipline him for wetting. James felt himself twice betrayed. Not only had his mother deserted him for the baby but she now fought with him at every meal and often punished him. He turned to his father for affection. As he was a bright boy and his father enjoyed teaching him, James soon learned to read. His father had two hobbies, medieval history and sports. James early became interested in history. Every night he and his father would discuss the valorous deeds of the Middle Ages, and a real friendship developed between them.

When James was almost eleven this bond was broken. The sister, now over six, began to show athletic skill. James had always been mediocre in sports, could not throw a ball well, was afraid to ride horseback. As the sister's athletic expertness increased, the father became more and more interested in her, less and less in James. The boy, disappointed now by his father as he had been by his mother, grew very jealous of the sister who had taken his parents' affection away from him. He felt incapable of vying with her and gave up not only his physical activities but also his reading interests. This change in his personality, at first shown only in the home, finally became evident in school. His marks grew much worse and he became the laughing stock of his gymnasium class.

James' jealousy of his sister's arrival was increased by his mother's anger at him for his misbehavior. It was further stimulated by his father's partiality toward the girl. James' envy was so intense that he could not even try to vie with his sister. He withdrew from all competition, at first in the home and later in school.

Ruth, a sixteen year old girl, was brought to the clinic because of failure in school and quarrelsome-ness at home. She was dissatisfied with everything her mother did for her, and was very unhappy. After several interviews it became clear that she was preoccupied with thoughts about her lack of popularity. She felt that the other girls in her high school sorority disliked her and that she had too few dates. She worried about her looks, believed her nose misshapen and her hair ugly. In the classroom she paid little attention to subject matter, but kept thinking about how she looked, how her profile impressed her schoolmates and who paid attention to whom.

Actually, Ruth was an unusually pretty girl with curly blonde hair and attractive features. It was true that she was not very popular with girls nor did she receive many invitations from boys. She was too

(Continued on page 127)

Shall We Divide Ourselves?

TERRY SPITALNY

"WHO do you like the best?" was suddenly sprung at the teacher, between mouthfuls of mashed potatoes. Suzy was five. She had a way of dawdling over her lunch to give the other children ample time to finish first. Then she could have a private, comfortable tête-à-tête with the teacher. Before the teacher could answer her question Suzy went on, "I know what you'll say, you'll say you like everyone the same. Grown-ups always do. But who do you like the best?" The teacher tried to explain to Suzy that everyone wanted to be liked the best. "Okay," said Suzy, "I tell you what: *Tell* all the kids you like everyone the same, just *like* me the best."

I think Suzy was tackling one of the deepest tension areas in parent-child and teacher-child relations. We sincerely try to understand the needs of young children and have made real strides in attempting to meet them. We've ceased being afraid of aggression, we're no longer shocked by dirty language, we answer questions about birth, babies, and sex. We try not to set unattainable standards for the child, we admire his paintings and hang them on the wall, we use the clay ash trays he makes for us, we clutter our homes with bookshelves, tie racks, and table mats. Even the cookies that are made of dough that has undoubtedly first been modeled into various animal shapes, dropped on the floor a few times, and possibly used as a baseball, are eaten with relish. We don't hesitate to say that the painting is our favorite, the ash tray is placed on our best antique table, and the cookies are pronounced to be the most delicious that we have ever eaten.

But what about our love? Are we as unstinting and generous with that? Let's see what we do. Johnny's mother is disturbed because Johnny won't go to sleep at night unless she sits with him. When she is asked why she doesn't sit with him, she says, "How can I? What about Peter and Mary, his brother and sister? It wouldn't be fair." Johnny also has a hard time resting at school. His teacher says he would rest if she would sit on his bed for all the rest hour. When she is asked whether she has ever sat on his bed for all the rest hour, she says, "How can I? What about the rest of the group? It wouldn't be fair." No wonder the constant cry of the children is "No Fair."

That Peter and Mary and Johnny will vie for their

mother's affection is indisputable. All children in all families are competing for their mothers' affection. So are the children in a school group competing for the teacher's affection, provided there is any affection for which to compete.

Do we lessen the competition and the rivalry by our so-called fairness? Perhaps we do, but if so, in a negative sort of way. The group doesn't get what Johnny doesn't get. Neither does Peter nor Mary get what Johnny doesn't get. Thus, no child can have what every child can't have. When Johnny's mother and Johnny's teacher say it wouldn't be fair to give Johnny their undivided attention, they usually add, "besides, if I start that sort of thing, it will go on forever." My plea is to start, and then see what happens. Most parents love all their children, but they can't love them in the same way. Each has his own unique personality, each wants his own unique kind of love. To the oft-repeated irate question, "Am I to divide myself in three?" the answer is simply that no child wants a third of his mother or his father.

Some parents plan their time ahead carefully so that one child will have them to himself for a few hours on Saturday afternoon, and another Sunday mornings. Yet ten unplanned minutes given spontaneously and whole-heartedly can mean infinitely more than a month of Saturday afternoons, for it isn't quantity that matters so much in human relations as quality. We may need to be a little freer with each child when we find ourselves alone with him, freer to talk to him, to listen to him, to permit ourselves to enjoy him as if for that moment he were the only child in the world. This isn't sinful. There will be occasions for such moments with the other children also. But if we have one eye on the door, lest we be caught in this clandestine relationship, we're lost. The child will feel just as much anxiety about the intruder as we do and the good relationship is spoiled.

Sometimes a mother will plan a special expedition with an older child, leaving the younger one at home; they go downtown, eat lunch at a restaurant, have a fine afternoon together. Before they go home, the mother says, "Let's get a present for sister." Getting a present for sister is fine, as long as the motive is present-getting. If the motive is appeasing mother's conscience, if she thinks she must be fair

to sister, that she must encourage brother to love sister, then the afternoon's fun may be dampened for brother, not because sister is to have a present but because mother *must* divide herself constantly. A child wants us all to himself when he has us. Only then can he learn to feel that he does not need us all the time.

We see this especially when a new baby is born in a family. Of course, the older child makes constant claims for attention. He may cry and fuss while his mother bathes or feeds the baby; he may fall and hurt himself often and need to be comforted; he may wet and soil again for a while, or forget how to dress himself, or wake screaming night after night. In a thousand ways he may keep his mother busy attending to his needs.

It may be hard for a mother to be patient with these extra demands when she has so many new duties to perform, when she needs more time and energy, not less. It is easy for her to respond by giving as little of herself as possible. She may go through motions of loving but still withhold the love for which the child is really asking. But if she feels deeply for the older child and senses the fear which keeps him demanding proofs of her love, then perhaps she will be able to tend him in the spirit he requires.

Of course, she can't neglect the new baby or give less of herself to him. But she can cuddle and rock the older child when the baby is safe again in his crib, even if the housework is neglected or dinner is late. She can change the wet pants with good humor. She can feed and dress the older child again if he seems to need it. Actually it may save time, and they can have fun together while she does it. She can comfort him if he wakes at night, without ever feeling reproachful.

If she gives her love freely in response to her child's need, that need will gradually subside. The claims will grow less as the child feels safer and he will be free to grow up again.

Strangely enough, teachers, who are not as involved emotionally with their groups as parents with their families, are just as resistant to the idea of special relationships with children. Whether a group has forty children or fourteen, teachers shrink from this idea. Over and over again, we hear, "It isn't fair to the others," "there isn't time, we must be realistic." Actually it isn't unfair to anyone and it doesn't take hours. It does, however, take some time, and it takes interest. It involves knowing each child, his interests, his likes, his dislikes, his idiosyncrasies, his high points and his low points. Every child will

tell us all about these things, if we give him the chance. The day at school is full of such chances. It's surprising how much it can mean to a child to have us *see* him every time we look at him.

Sometimes a child needs more than a friendly glance, more than the distinction of being sent on an errand. He may want us to sit with him all through the rest hour. Will the others be jealous? Not necessarily. If the teacher is sure of her relationship with the other children, if she has no misgivings about playing favorites, if she goes to the child who needs her just as she would go to him if he fell off the swing, the other children will accept the situation in good spirit.

Jealousies and rivalries are inevitable in young children. We cannot eradicate them, but we can help the child to live with them and not be hurt by them. Let's not try to prevent jealousy by rationing our love in an effort to be fair. With rationing there is inevitably hoarding. When commodities are doled out, we put an enormous amount of energy into watching to see what the other fellow gets. We feel the meagerness and scarcity, and always feel slightly hungry. The other fellow may be more efficient than we in making his share satisfy him longer. We are not interested in his efficiency; all we can see is that he still apparently has what we no longer have. "No fair," we cry at whatever the apportionment may be, and before we know it, we are grabbing indiscriminately.

One of the wisest and saddest observations I have ever heard was made by five year old Mary. She had been living in the country. From the time she was two, a friend from the city had come to spend his summers with her. When Mary came to the city, she found herself in a nursery school group with her summer playmate. One day, her mother commented on the fact that Mary never spoke of her old friend, never invited him to her house.

"Oh," said the child, "we are not friends any more."

"Why not?" asked the mother.

"He doesn't like me."

"But that can't be possible. You and he have been such good friends for all those summers in the country."

"Oh well," said Mary, "that was in the country. There were just the two of us. When there are two, it is easy to be friends. But as soon as there are more than two, it is very different."

She was right. It is always different. It can never be the same. Learning this is a lifetime job.

Rivalry in School — The Teacher's Problem

RHODA HARRIS

A GROUP of five year old children were playing in the outdoor period of the morning session at school. The boys had a large boat, sailing the far seas. A group of girls were playing house. Judy, very, very small for her age but with tremendous ideas, and Carol, easy-going and with blond curls, were making food of clay and placing it carefully on a large stone to bake. The other housekeepers were arranging flowers, sweeping, and building an additional room.

Carol patted a pie lovingly, rolled an eye to Judy's pie, and said comfortably, "Mine is bigger than yours."

"It is not."

"It is so."

"Yours is *very* small."

"It is not and mine was bigger yesterday."

"Mine was bigger yesterday, too," Carol said, very smugly.

Judy grabbed her pie, clapped it on top of Carol's pie.

"There—your old pie was stinky." There was a brief struggle and Judy threw both pies into the air.

"Mine was bigger than yours. I'm bigger than you are, too," Carol sputtered. They were facing each other, breathing hard and glaring. Judy stood as tall as possible, but before she could get her feelings into words Carol continued,

"I'm bigger. My feet are bigger. Look at your rubbers—little bitsy rubbers."

"They are not." Judy was really beside herself.
"You—You!—"

"My father is bigger than your father, too. He's a great big man. See!" she said, sticking out her tongue. At this, Judy jumped on to what had been the table and stood far higher than anyone else. The boys in the boat and the other housekeepers looked. Judy stamped her foot and shouted, "My mother is the boss of this whole thing. She *is* the boss! She's the boss of everything in the whole world!" She jumped off and with her face and fists both screwed up she advanced upon Carol and chased her into a daisy field where she caught her, hammered her, and they both came back to their house. The other members of the group had returned to their affairs.

A group of fourth-graders were working at three different levels in spelling. The teacher was trying

to have the slow group pull up, and they were working on page 128, the fast group on page 43. Each day there was much discussion as to who was ahead. The teacher finally became so worn out by the wrangling that when the new books were given out, again on three levels, she kept all groups on the same page. The assignment was then alike for all and the group worked peacefully for several weeks, during which the competition subsided and the teacher was able to return to the first plan.

An eleven year old girl was bouncing a ball against a wall and practicing catch. A boy of like age came along, caught the ball, and ran with it. "That's my ball, give it to me." The boy went through many motions as though to throw it. The girl went through many motions as though to catch it. Finally the boy threw the ball but so hard that it passed the girl. She ran, but the boy outran her, picked up the ball, and the same performance was repeated. The boy had the girl running back and forth while each time he outran her, hurling such remarks as "Girls can't play ball. Do you want a ball? What for? Come and get it."

A city school moved its classes to the country for the month of June. One morning the eight year old group was ready to go down the hill to see a litter of baby pigs born the night before. The group was eager to be off but could not start because Evelyn and Josie stood in the path, having a fight. Both children had been recently confirmed in their separate churches. The fight had evidently been raging since the previous evening and had to do with prayers.

"Who says I can't say prayers? I can so—I say them every night."

"You don't either—my grandmother says—"

"I do so."

"Who do you pray to?"

"I pray to God! So there!"

Josie drew herself up to her full size.

"*You* pray to God! How can you? *God is Polish!*"

A three year old child with unbelievable dexterity took her baby sister out of the crib and laid her carefully at the top of the front stairs. Then she went down the back stairs to tell her mother that the baby was lying on the floor in the upper hall and she was afraid the baby would fall down the stairs.

In ways like these, we see the manifestations of

rivalry and competition revealing themselves constantly and at every age level. Rivalry over things, rivalry between boys and girls, between children in a family, between mothers over their children, rivalry over marks in school, over performance in games and play—we are confronted with an endless list of behavior patterns which are indicative of the deep feelings and strong drives which rivalry calls forth. The spirit of rivalry is there, always demanding and forcing itself into action. It is an inseparable part of children's need for feelings of adequacy, for survival, for security. There is nothing wrong or shocking in it.

The trouble is that it is so often misinterpreted, misguided, and badly handled. Its appearance in the school situation for any one child is not unrelated to his earlier or current manifestations of rivalry at home. As it appears at home it is shocking to parents. Sisters and brothers, they feel, should love each other. Parents try to be fair, careful to see that each child has his share, scrupulous in treating one child like each other child. Parents are therefore bitterly resentful that hate and hostility break loose, that their children vie with each other, that they wrangle, that they are mean and hateful, that they threaten the peace and repudiate the affections of the family.

In schools we find two widely different attitudes. One type of school contends that all life is based on competition, that it is good for children and that the strongest survive. Such administrators say that if the same children win all the time, that proves that they are the strongest and that is life—they had better get used to it. The other type of school works in a co-operative rather than in a competitive spirit and its staff is frustrated and discouraged when rivalry and competition persist to interrupt and divert the emotions and interests of the children. When individuals are having a rich experience in living together, are working in an environment which gives each one the maximum opportunity to contribute fully to the group welfare, why, they contend, should rivalry persist?

Parents and teachers show violent reactions to these many evidences of the strong feelings of rivalry that surge about in children's everyday behavior. As adults, we are the most inadequate when we try to handle expressions of rivalry through talk, through a reasonable interpretation to which panting, eye-flashing children are expected to listen patiently and emerge as peaceful, quiet youngsters who will not feel or act so violently again.

The diagnosis of these symptoms of rivalry is really

not difficult. They are so old in the experience of the race, so common to every family, so basic in the feeling and in the experience of each individual that one can usually see what has brought them about. The three-year-old is happy in the anticipation of having a little sister, is delighted with the new baby, is pleased and proud to be the big girl who walks to market and now sleeps in a big bed in a room all her own. Yet when she beholds the usurper in the crib, in the carriage, in the play pen, in her own little baby blanket, other feelings take possession and she lugs the baby to the head of the stairs. This is not hard to understand.

Nor is it difficult to see that Judy's feelings of adequacy were threatened by her size. She was the youngest child in a family of four children. Both parents were teachers in the school, working with older children. Judy was the youngest, the smallest, she had the smaller pie, her feet were small, her rubbers were small, her father was small, but her mother was the boss of the whole school—even the world. That last thought gave her the courage to give a good pummeling to her taunter. Josie and Evelyn lived in a city community where religious and race rivalries were evident and active in all their daily living. They were obligated to cling to and fight for their own. The program of education planned about a visit to the new born pigs at the farm could wait.

The difficult problem is how to treat such expressions of rivalry and what to do about the feelings which accompany them, so that hostility, resentment, and aggression do not become the everyday pattern for getting along with people, and the dominant and usual attack on all situations. It will take all the insight, imagination, firmness, and self-control that the adult can muster to handle these rivalries wisely so that they are constructive and not destructive, so that they are directed rather than repressed, so that they foster growth rather than create new situations overcharged with unspent emotion.

We who daily come in contact with these intense feelings of rivalry must first work on ourselves. We must fully believe that these are not *bad* feelings and that their expression does not condemn children as bad children. It is normal and healthy to feel this way. Each rivalry situation must be worked out in the way that has most merit for the individuals and for the group concerned. The good working out of single situations is not invalidated because rivalry appears again even the same day or the same week with the

(Continued on page 126)

Adolescent Rivalries

RUTH BRICKNER, M.D.

ADOLESCENCE may be a period of intense feeling. The comparative calm of mid-childhood is lost and all the turbulence of the earliest years comes to the surface again. Old rivalries between brothers and sisters flare up, and family life may be strained with constant squabbles or those endless physical scuffles which start in play and end, all too often, in violent battles.

Parents come in for their share of the hostilities, too. Their erstwhile pleasant sons and daughters become sarcastic, argumentative, moody, critical, and very loving by turns—often all in the same day. For early, almost forgotten jealousies between fathers and sons, mothers and daughters are reawakened at this time and charged with new intensity, as boys and girls grope their way toward adulthood and feel the need to prove themselves as men and women.

Parents need all the wisdom, maturity and humor they can muster to live through these struggles without too much personal distress and with the greatest helpfulness to their children. Now if ever they need both self-knowledge and an objective understanding of their children as individuals.

What any youth is at this point, and what he needs, depend in part on all that has gone before in the life of the family, and in equal part on his own constitutional make-up. Actually, the inborn quality of any child plays an important part in determining all his experiences and his own reaction to them.

The constitutionally aggressive, demanding type of child, for example, is sure to experience more jealousy and frustration than the constitutionally gentle, tender one, no matter what sort of family he lives in. He will feel more threatened by the arrival of a new baby. He will feel more anger at his parents when they thwart him in any way. Because of his demanding nature, they will be forced to thwart him more often, and he will need constant proof of affection and more assurance of parental love than are necessary for the less aggressive children. He will be driven to compete with older, or abler, or more attractive brothers and sisters no matter how uneven the odds. The child of gentler disposition can often accept such realities with little stress and no great need to struggle. It will take the most extreme type of family situation to call forth hostility in him.

We have been so preoccupied in recent years with

the problems of the more aggressive children, the ones who bite, scream, and throw things, that we have lost sight of the gentler children. One young mother I know was quite disturbed when the school psychologist told her reprovingly that her child had no hostility in his nature. She was embarrassed and felt that the child was somehow lacking.

Life is often happier and less tense for the more gentle children. They find their satisfactions more easily. One such young girl I know is a happy, well-adjusted adolescent, friendly, popular, warm in her relations to people, and quite pleased with life as she finds it. Her brothers and sisters are abler and more aggressive, yet she has never felt threatened or bitter.

She is, however, a very different sort of person from those seemingly gentle and unhappy ones who felt hostile and bitter in childhood, and who withdrew from all strife and competition in defeat and resignation. They are not really gentle or loving and never have been.

The truly gentle children may need some encouragement to assert themselves and some protection against their more aggressive brothers and sisters. But they often attain a wholeness of personality that the more competitive young people do not.

Our aggressive boys and girls, on the other hand, need help in accordance with their own innate pattern. Progressive educators have seen this clearly on the nursery school level and have developed all sorts of devices and procedures which give direct outlet to the rivalries and aggressions of young children. But strangely enough, the need of these same boys and girls for such outlets in their adolescent years is almost entirely overlooked. Cooperation and group accomplishment are stressed so heavily in the upper grades of many progressive schools that all forms of competitive activity become suspect. Chances for individual recognition are frequently lacking or are slighted. The more primitive sports like football and wrestling are banned, too, in many cases. Yet it is just such thinly disguised forms of combat that many of our most aggressive youngsters need to drain off some of their more explosive feelings.

Certainly no one could wish for the return to the fiercely competitive standards of the traditional school or for its complete disregard of the welfare of the non-aggressive child. Many thoughtful educators

are, however, beginning to realize that their programs must be varied enough to meet the needs of both types of children. In their schools there is ample opportunity for group enterprise and also for many socially approved activities for differing talents and temperaments. The non-aggressive boys and girls have satisfactory alternatives and are not forced into situations which threaten them. But the rougher competitive sports are reinstated, too, with great benefit to the more combative youngsters.

Many of us, as parents, have a distaste for these rough games and all that they imply. But when we can permit our more aggressive children this kind of direct outlet in play, we do something toward helping them solve their personal problems, and incidentally, toward preserving the family peace. Younger or gentler brothers and sisters are spared a good deal of wear and tear, and the aggressive ones escape the guilt and distress which they so often feel if they take out their feelings too freely in the family setting.

These competitive youngsters need help of another sort, too. They need good-natured insistence on the rules of fair play in dealing with younger and weaker children and, above all, they must have support in accepting themselves more completely. For parents who enjoy the fighter, this latter task will be easier than for those who are themselves disturbed by strife. The more sure of themselves these boys and girls become, the less need they will have to dominate others by fair means or foul. Domination gradually changes to leadership and a protective attitude, and thus the more positive aspects of rivalry come into play.

When the older or stronger child has made this kind of peace with himself, we often find the younger brothers and sisters taking over many of his more grown-up qualities as their own. This can have its amusing aspects. In one family the younger of two adolescent boys became distinctly more organized in his work and personal habits as he modeled himself after his big brother. So far so good; but he felt equally challenged to have a steady girl and a daily correspondence, although at the age of thirteen neither he nor his girl friend quite knew what it was all about.

This kind of identification is the normal solution of rivalry, not only between younger and older children, but between children and their parents as well. Just because the gap in age and strength is not so great, it is often easier to take an older brother or sister as the first model. Many younger boys and

girls are helped toward maturity in this way.

If all goes well in family life, adolescent boys eventually take over their fathers as models and girls their mothers. Some adolescents take a long time to pass through the hostile stage and many of them are very hard to live with for a while. Most young people are, however, able to sink their rivalry in identification when they have finally become more secure in themselves and have established their independence and adulthood to their own satisfaction.

I know one boy who fought his father bitterly all through the high school years. The father himself was mild and tolerant and brought little direct pressure on his son; but the boy's feeling of rivalry was intense. The youth was away at college for several years. When he came home he was sure of himself as a man, with a steady girl of his own and all his young manhood ahead. The hostility was gone. He was friendly and courteous to his father again, even protective, and insistent on his father's rights as head of the family.

In many cases such a period of separation, whether for college or for work, or for service in the armed forces, is almost essential at this stage if boys and girls are to establish their maturity without too much emotional strain for themselves and their parents. The parents must, however, be prepared to accept as healthy and sound the independence born of such separation. Otherwise, the child's return will only mean renewed friction.

We know that adolescent problems begin long before the onset of puberty. Boys and girls bring to their adolescent struggles the patterns and feelings of their earlier relationships in the family. If they have felt unloved or unsatisfied as small children, they may be hostile and bitter as adolescents or, perhaps, overdependent and unable to break away. If they have been too closely tied to one parent, they may have to fight harder to get free and may identify finally with the other.

One mother I know created problems for both her children because of her own immaturity when they were young. She loved her first child passionately. He filled her long felt need for a baby and especially for a boy child. When the second child, a little girl, came, she too was loved, but not with the same intensity. Both children suffered. The boy had been too close to his mother. At adolescence his struggle for freedom was a difficult one and his hostility was marked. His sister, on the other hand, had felt deprived all through her early childhood and hostile to her mother. All three finally worked

through their difficulties with professional help and established a warm and genuine relationship. But this girl has had to prolong her dependency to make up for lost time, as it were. She will probably free herself in time, but the early years have made this stage more difficult for her.

Even when children are fully grown their parents may remain emotionally immature and in these cases the adolescent rivalries are, perhaps, most bitter. In one family the mother was one of those young-looking, attractive women who cannot bear to grow old and her pretty grown daughters were a threat to her. She did not understand her own feelings, but she expressed her rivalry in the kind of constant nagging and criticism that is always undermining and destructive. The girls reacted quite typically, each according to her nature. The more timid one retired into herself, withdrew from competition, and finally left home entirely. The more aggressive one fought back as hard as she could. She competed for masculine attention in the most obvious way; her clothes and make-up were loud and vulgar. It was her way of getting even with her mother by disgracing her in this public manner.

Immature fathers create similar problems through unrecognized jealousy of their growing sons. Quite without sensing their real reasons, such fathers may hedge their boys about with restrictions no longer suitable to their age, such as unreasonable limits on money, on hours, on driving the car, on the company their sons keep and the places they go, all calculated to keep them little boys in action, if not in age. It is not surprising that the boys fight back with all sorts of difficult behavior.

This is not to imply that all the adolescent problems are the fault of the parents—if indeed such things are ever to be viewed in terms of fault. The real concern is to understand the problem and to find the kind of help which will untangle these lives and allow them to progress toward maturity.

But even mature and reasonable parents are apt to find themselves in conflict with their adolescent sons and daughters at times. There is enough rivalry and jealousy in the normal family situation to produce a liberal measure of irritating behavior. At this stage parents of adolescents may expect criticism of their clothes, their friends, their political or religious opinions, their living arrangements, their old foggy standards, their management of the younger children, or even their whole way of life. Mature adults should be able to take this kind of "sniping" without feeling too much the threat to themselves. All of us lose

patience and explode at times, but it is wise to remember that a little humor here goes a long way.

Each generation must finally find its own values and live by them. It is especially important for parents and for their children, too, that the adults in the family be sure enough of their own values to stand by them firmly, even as they grant the young people the right to differ. Parents should be able to offer their maturing boys and girls some considered values and standards as the best that they have learned from living. They are wise, however, if they do not represent their own convictions as unchallengeable.

Often our young people reject our standards for a while and return to them in the end. Sometimes they continue in quite different directions. I believe that many parents mar their relationship with their children permanently because they are unable or unwilling to accept this fundamental kind of healthy self-assertion in adolescence. Often this does not show itself easily; it may not appear until the need arrives for choosing a vocation. One girl of my acquaintance had planned to study law, her father's profession. Having no sons to follow in his footsteps, the father was pleased to have one daughter share his interests. They were alike in many ways and the girl became almost a substitute for a son. While she was away at college she suddenly changed her plans. She transferred her interests from law to radical politics, indirectly attacking her father's conservatism. The father was bitterly disappointed but wisely brought no pressure on her to continue with the original plan. Though neither of them realized it at this point, the girl had taken a healthy first step in breaking her earlier identification. She was able later to relate herself to her father as a daughter instead of as a son.

Boys, too, often change lifelong plans during late adolescence. They may refuse to enter the family business or suddenly lose interest in a family profession they had long accepted as their natural future vocation. Or, on the contrary, having refused to follow in the family's footsteps, they may return after a period of separation with new-found eagerness to work with their fathers or to embrace the same interests.

It is tremendously important that we continue to support our children in any genuine search for wholeness and truth, even when they reject our plans and aspirations on the way. Their needs may not be ours. We can remain close to them in maturity only by respecting their separateness and the way of life they choose.

Parents' Questions and Discussion

One of my best students, an intelligent freshman in a girl's college, came in, at my request, for a conference about her year's work. Her papers, while spasmodically brilliant, were as a rule careless, unfinished and late. Her manners were crude, her dress, hair, nails untidy. In the course of our chatting together, I found myself calling attention to her appearance, pointing out to her the very bad impression she was making on others. She suddenly broke down and cried, and poured out a story full of resentment against her young, attractive, well-dressed mother who has nagged her for years, the girls says, because she has shown greater interest in her studies than in her clothes and general appearance. This girl is pretty and she might easily make herself very attractive. It occurred to me that she was using her sloppy dress and behavior as a means of "getting back" at her mother. As she sobbed, I wanted to try to help her, but I thought that perhaps the problem was too deep-rooted for anyone but an expert to tackle. Or is this a usual mother-daughter difficulty?

In this day of young mothers, or young looking and young acting mothers, it is not unusual to find a mother and her adolescent daughter at odds. It is true that many young girls are proud to have young looking mothers, but others feel resentful, perhaps because their particular mothers have an exaggerated interest in keeping young. They want a mother, not someone who might be their sister. Many girls in their middle teens need guidance in just such simple matters as personal appearance, proper clothes, good manners (as well as in life's bigger problems) but it is hard to accept it from mothers who seemingly enter into competition with them, quite often unconsciously, and refuse to play a mother-role. The daughters of such women may sense this and resent their mothers considering them a threat to youth. Some of these girls withdraw from the competition as this girl has, expressing her fight in general sloppiness, which has unfortunately carried over to her school work as well.

Expert help is important, even in such normal, everyday problems, and it is to be hoped that in all our colleges, students who seem to need guidance will find well-trained student counselors available. If no such service is provided where you teach, can you help this young girl to seek it elsewhere?

My oldest boy, Jack, and his father don't get on at all. Bill, who is only ten, is just like his father, good at sports, popular, quick to turn a penny. Of course my husband adores him. But Jack, who is two years older, is the studious, dreamy type. I don't find him hard to manage but he and his father are at sword's points all the time. I must admit that Jack seems to go out of his way to provoke his dad. He's sloppy and forgetful about his chores, sullen, even impertinent and disobedient at times. There are constant scenes and many punishments: Jack thinks his father picks on him, and in a way it's true. It's hard on all of us. What can I do?

Your problem is not an easy one but one which happens in a good many families. I believe you are aware already that Jack is jealous of his brother, apparently with pretty good reason. He resents your husband's open preference for Bill. It does look as though Jack goes out of his way to provoke his father, though I doubt if he knows it himself. Because this kind of fighting back is seldom deliberate, it just makes matters worse.

Perhaps you can help your husband to see what he is doing. He may like his younger son better than the other, but he can learn to understand and respect the older boy's interests and needs, and he can control his open display of favoritism. Once he realizes how much Jack needs his love and respect, he may be able to understand the boy's provoking behavior and his own part in causing it. Then perhaps he won't be quite so ready to nag and punish. With fewer demands and more appreciation Jack should gradually grow easier to live with, but it will take some effort on his part, too. Eventually father and son may come to some sort of real understanding, but you will have to be patient and tactful with both of them.

We are expecting a new baby very soon. We don't want our little daughter, who is now two and a half, to be jealous. She has been told that there will be a newcomer and likes to hear stories about what she will do to help. To date it hasn't occurred to her to ask where the baby is. Do you think we should make this information part of the story? Or should we wait for the question?

You are quite right in being so ready to help your little daughter to accept the coming baby. It is almost sure to be a struggle for her when

the time comes. No amount of preparation can actually keep a child from being jealous, but her jealousy will be easier for her to handle because she has felt and will continue to feel that you love her. That's what counts most—your feeling for her and your desire to help her. Just how you do it is, perhaps, less important.

I'm not sure that it matters very much whether you tell her now or later where the baby comes from. If you feel ready to accept such questions they are sure to come presently. It can't hurt to give your child the information now if you can do so very simply, and it may make it easier to explain to her why you will be going away to the hospital.

Do whatever you can to make your little girl feel that she is loved but don't feel that you have failed if she is upset or openly jealous after the new baby arrives. It will be easier for her, and for you too, if you can accept jealousy as normal and natural, as just one of the experiences we all must face in growing up.

My younger son is nine and still hasn't learned to read although tests show him to have a better-than-average I.Q. His older brother began sounding out words when he was barely five and was reading fluently at six. We've been hoping John's reading would catch up and for months now my husband has tutored him every night but he doesn't seem to make much progress. Now I am really frightened about the child's inability to read at his age. We have had John's eyes tested. Is there anything else we should do?

There are many possible reasons for reading difficulties. Since you have checked your boy's eyesight and his I.Q. and eliminated these obvious possibilities, one is led to suspect an emotional problem here. Competition with an unusually able older brother may be the principal cause in John's case. The age of reading readiness varies. Your older boy apparently learned easily and read earlier than most children do. If John has been made to feel defensive or inferior because he was not ready to read as soon, he may have given up the struggle and taken refuge in being totally different by not reading at all. Many children withdraw in this way from competition they cannot meet, though they themselves seldom know why.

Perhaps you have made John feel that his reading mattered too much to you. Do you and his father share his other interests and enjoy with him the things he can do well?

No matter what the cause, it is usually unwise for parents to attempt tutoring their own children who have serious learning difficulties. Help can be given with less emotion by an outside person and will be easier for the child to accept. Sometimes arrangements can be made through the school. In this case I think it would be wise for you to get the advice of a specialist in reading difficulties or in child guidance, if one is available. If not, be sure to have the tutoring done by a warm friendly person who has a way with children and who will be able to gain the confidence and friendship of your boy. A happy relationship plays a very important part in the success of any such program.

I am assuming that you really do mean that your child has not *learned* to read, and not merely that he is uninterested in reading as a recreational pursuit. It seems fair to assume that some children are more interested than others in reading for pleasure.

Suggestions for Study: Jealousy and Rivalry in Children

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

I. THERE ARE JEALOUSIES IN EVERY HOME

Children naturally long to have their parents all for themselves. They are almost sure to be jealous of their brothers and sisters and of the affection their parents show one another, too. Learning to deal with these feelings is just part of growing up in a family, although for some children this is a harder struggle than for others. A good deal of quarrelling and fighting is to be expected. Parents need not be greatly disturbed unless the bitterness and hostility is extreme. It is healthy for children to express these feelings openly. We should be more concerned about those who withdraw from competition in apparent indifference and apathy. Where jealousy and rivalry are extreme and destructive, the cause is usually found either in the parents' attitude toward one another or in their attitudes toward their individual children. If parents are too intense in their feeling for each other their children may feel unloved and so compete all the harder for affection. If parents value one child above another, even unconsciously, bitter rivalry results. Actual differences in sex, in ability, or in looks, may play their part, but it is primarily the importance of such differences to the parents which give them importance for the children.

II. JEALOUSIES AND RIVALRIES COME OUT AT SCHOOL, TOO

Children play out many of their jealous feelings at school. Their relations with their own parents and brothers and sisters are reflected in their attitudes toward teachers and other boys and girls. Family feelings also lie behind many strong work interests and dislikes.

They may be the root of an apparent inability to learn or of a total indifference to failure. They determine to a large degree any child's drive for success in school work, in games, in the social life of the school. Schools differ markedly in their attitudes toward rivalry. In some, competition is heavily stressed; in others, cooperation and group accomplishment are consciously fostered. A good school should meet both needs in its children. Cooperative experiences are important, but some wholesome outlets for aggression and rivalry are needed too, especially by the more robust individuals. Many educators see this need clearly in young children, but too often they fail to provide such outlets for older boys and girls. Teachers and parents must be able to accept rivalry and aggression in children of all ages in order to guide them most constructively.

III. MUST WE DIVIDE OURSELVES?

Parents and teachers are often troubled by the seemingly conflicting demands of children. They are afraid to meet fully the needs of any child, lest the others be jealous. Too often, as a result, they mar every relationship by withholding something from it. Children want us all to themselves, but if they have us fully and completely at the times when we are with them, they learn gradually that they do not need us all the time. It is not the time spent with each child but the quality of each experience which counts. If for any reason a child doubts our love, he will become especially demanding. The birth of a new baby is usually felt as just such a threat by the older child and he may make all sorts of indirect demands upon his mother at this time. If she can give her love freely and with extra attention, the child will gradually regain his faith and give up the demanding behavior. But if she gives herself grudgingly and with one eye on her other tasks, he will not be fooled. Children react to what we feel, no matter what we do or say.

IV. RIVALRIES MAY BE INTENSE AT ADOLESCENCE

At adolescence, old and almost forgotten rivalries between brothers and sisters, parents and children flare up again. There may be a good deal of friction in the life of the family. Parents need wisdom, maturity, and humor to live through this period without too much distress and with real helpfulness to their children. They need also self-knowledge and understanding of their children as individuals. How difficult the period will be depends on many factors: the youth's own constitutional pattern and his reaction to early experiences in the family; and the maturity of his parents in the past and at this time when he is reaching toward adulthood. If all goes well in family life, boys and girls finally work through their jealous feelings and identify to some degree with their parents or with older brothers and sisters. But before they can do this they must feel sure of themselves as men and women in their own right. Parents are most helpful to boys and girls of this age, when they feel sure of their own values and can offer mature counsel and advice while still permitting their children independence of thought and action. Young people need the right to question and criticize and to search for their own way of life. It is important for parents to respect this search for wholeness and truth even when—as sometimes happens—the children reject long-standing parental plans and aspirations on the way.

QUESTIONS TO ANSWER

1. Mrs. X is nursing her new baby. He is thriving and she enjoys the experience but she is troubled about her three year old daughter who cries every time she sees the baby at the breast. What should this mother do?

2. Five year old David, the youngest of a family of four children, boasts constantly and with no regard for truth or realism. His father points out to him again and again that his statements are untrue, just wishful thinking. Will this help? Why does the child behave this way? How might he be helped?

3. Ten year old Alice is a goody-goody child with no strong interests of her own and a great desire to please adults. Her younger brother is a more daring soul who goes after what he wants with directness and energy even though it often lands him in conflict with authority. Alice delights in tattling whenever she catches him doing something forbidden. She tattles at school, too. Which child should be considered a problem? What has jealousy to do with all this?

REFERENCE READING

<i>The Parents' Manual</i>	1941	
by Anna W. M. Wolf Chapter IV, Brothers and Sisters		Simon & Schuster
<i>The Nursery Years</i>	1937	
by Susan Isaacs		Vanguard Press
<i>Psychoanalysis for Teachers and Parents</i>	1934	Emerson Books
<i>The Inner World of Childhood</i>	1927	
Frances G. Wickes		D. Appleton-Century Co.
<i>Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence</i>	1940	
by Caroline Zachry		D. Appleton-Century Co.
<i>Studies in Sibling Rivalry</i>	1938	American Orthopsychiatric Assn.
by David M. Levy, M.D.		

A WORKING FELLOWSHIP IN PARENT EDUCATION

We are glad to report a new working fellowship in parent education with the Child Study Association, made possible through a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Grant Straus. We hope that this is a beginning in opportunities for specialized training in parent education of the kind which were so notably advanced by the program of grants from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, 1924-36. The Child Study Association played a part in that program.

The appointment for 1946-47 has been awarded to Mrs. Margaret Meigs, B.A. Swarthmore College, M.A. Teachers College, Columbia University. Mrs. Meigs has taught at Shady Hill School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and other progressive schools. Since 1938, she has been research and instructional associate at Teachers College. She is also school psychologist at the Brooklyn Friends School, and is the mother of three young children.

Science Contributors

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TEST—PANACEA OR MYTH?

MORRIS KRUGMAN

SOME very strange notions are in circulation about psychological tests. After forty years of use, there are still those who look upon them with an awe not unlike that of the frontiersman purchasing a patent medicine capable of curing everything from chillblain to cancer. There are others who look upon the psychological test with complete distrust and suspicion, refusing to credit it with any usefulness whatever.

As is usual with extremes, neither of these schools of thought has validity. The psychological test is neither a crystal ball nor a complete "dud." It is a scientific instrument capable of performing many useful functions in many areas involving human beings. At the same time, it has innumerable limitations and shortcomings, and, in some situations, can even be harmful. Even under ideal conditions, when used by the expert, the psychological test frequently leaves much to be desired; when used by the novice or the charlatan, it can have dire consequences, if taken seriously.

The psychological test is a diagnostic instrument, and, like the X-ray or the laboratory test in medicine, is not intended to serve as a remedy. It may be a means to a cure, but is not the cure itself. It may present a picture of what the person is like in some aspects of human behavior or function, but much more than a picture is necessary to remedy some serious defect in behavior, learning, or other type of adjustment. On the other hand, to work without such a picture is to work in the dark, putting about in hit-or-miss fashion.

Just what, then, can the different psychological tests do? They can do a number of things.

In the first place, they can give us a measure of an individual's learning capacity in the academic fields. This is usually, and erroneously, called "intelligence," and because the result is given a numerical value and called the Intelligence Quotient, or I.Q., most people accept it on faith. We tend to accept without question those things which are put in mathematical terms, because that makes them appear more scientific and so more valid. Actually, the I.Q. measures only a part of the intelligence. It measures the ability to learn abstract and verbal subject matter in school. It does not measure practical or mechanical

ability, or the ability to deal with other people, or musical ability, art ability, or any of a host of other types of functions which require intelligence of another sort.

In the second place, psychological tests can give us a measure of practical ability which is another type of intelligence that we often forget about. Many children and adults who lack a high degree of abstract or verbal intelligence may possess a high degree of concrete or practical intelligence. It is wrong, however, to think that a low verbal I.Q. is necessarily accompanied by a high practical I.Q., as some people seem to think. In fact, good ability in both often go together. In any individual case, however, we never can generalize; we must apply the tests and find out.

Psychological tests can also give us a measure of the extent to which one has benefited from school instruction and has learned what has been taught him, particularly in such educational fundamentals as reading, spelling, and arithmetic. Psychological tests do not, however, stop with the three R's, but can measure achievement in any field of learning, whether history, geography, algebra and languages, or music and painting. The intelligence test, which is one type of psychological test, measures the capacity for learning, while the achievement test, which is also a psychological test, measures the extent to which one has actually used that learning capacity and has profited from instruction.

Psychological tests further can give us some measure of special aptitudes, such as mechanical, clerical, musical, artistic, engineering, scientific, and many other special abilities. In this field, however, psychological tests are not yet as highly developed as in some of the others, and we must use them with caution. For example, if a boy has demonstrated great interest and skill in working with tools over a period of years, such a fact would constitute a better measure of mechanical aptitude than a score on any presently known test of mechanical aptitude. The same is true of demonstrated musical ability, particularly when judged by a skilled musician. The point is that aptitude tests aim to predict what a child probably will accomplish after he has had training. If the accomplishment has been demonstrated

in the life situation, then the need for further prediction loses much of its immediacy value.

In still another field, psychological tests have been developed, but here with mixed success. In attempting to measure personality and emotional factors, psychologists and others have constructed instruments, a few of which have been successful, notably the Thematic Apperception and Rorschach tests discussed hereafter. Other tests, however, have tried to imitate, by various devices, the techniques of the psychiatrist and, although logic was on their side, most of them failed to produce the expected results. Somehow, the essence of the personality eluded the testers. In spite of this, they are widely used, and much harm is done by them.

The reason for the failure of most personality tests, and there are hundreds of them, is that they attempt a direct approach to the study of personality. The questions they ask are perfectly sound psychological questions. Most of us are so constituted, however, that, consciously or unconsciously, we tend to protect our personalities when we are under attack. Asking us intimate, personal questions constitutes such an attack. How many of us will discuss frankly in an impersonal, "objective" questionnaire, such matters as our inner feelings, or our relationships with husband or wife, with parents, children, or friends? How many of us are ready to discuss our loves, hates, fears, or guilt feelings? It takes psychiatrists many hours of skilful interviewing and discussion to elicit some of this information even if we come to them for help. How, then, can we expect a set of printed questions to serve the same purpose? The fact is that, in spite of the authors' claims, personality tests of the questionnaire variety, and most of them are that, do not work. They are usually employed by those who don't know any better, or by those who should know better. Only in one special situation did this type of personality test function fairly well as a screening device designed to determine those in need of a full psychiatric study: in the selective service process and in the subsequent army and navy classification procedure. They worked because those who wished to be rejected in the draft, or discharged from the armed forces, had every inducement to tell the truth about their emotional symptoms. They worked, too, because they were not relied upon as personality tests, since further study of the individual by psychiatrists was usually available. In civilian life, however, the situation is different. What inducement does one have to discuss his symptoms frankly if, by so doing, he may fail to be admitted to college, fail to get a

job, or fail of promotion to a better job? The one who tells the truth is penalized, while the one who does not, is rewarded. Nor is it entirely a matter of honesty, since unconscious factors play an important rôle in protecting us when emotions are involved.

There are some types of personality tests that work very well, but they cannot be used by any but very skilful and specially trained psychiatrists and psychologists. These are known as projective techniques. They do not rely upon replies to direct questions, but are based on indirect methods of response which produce reflections or projections of inner thoughts and feelings that cannot be censored, either consciously or unconsciously, by the person responding. There are many kinds of projective techniques, but there are two that have proved most valuable for the study of personality. These are the Thematic Apperception Test and the Rorschach Psychodiagnostics Examination.

The Thematic Apperception Test is an outgrowth of a psychological device used by many psychologists and developed to its present stage at the Harvard Psychological Clinic by Dr. H. A. Murray and his co-workers. It consists of a series of pictures to which the subject responds by giving the story of each picture. The pictures in this test are so constituted that they mean different things to different people. There is no such thing as a right or wrong answer. Each person's responses are peculiar to him, and reflect his own ways of thinking and feeling. The analysis and interpretation of the responses constitute a very complicated process and only the expert can get any meaning out of them.

The Rorschach Examination is at the same time similar to and different from the Thematic Apperception Test. It was first presented twenty-five years ago, after ten years of experimentation, by Dr. Hermann Rorschach, a Swiss psychiatrist. It consists of ten plates containing standardized inkblots, some in black and white, and some in color. The subject merely tells what the pictures might be. Here again, there are no right or wrong responses. Each individual responds with his own particular and individualistic associations. The possibilities of responses are so numerous and varied, and the method of scoring and interpretation so complex, that it requires years of training and experience with the test before even very competent psychiatrists and psychologists can use it properly. In the hands of the skilful professional, it is an amazing instrument for yielding a picture of personality; in the hands of the inexpert,

it is not only useless, but harmful. It has now been experimented with for thirty-five years, if we include Rorschach's original work, and has been used in innumerable situations with hundreds of experimenters throughout the world. Even so, it is still far from perfect, but its weaknesses are being ironed out almost daily.

In spite of its importance as a psychological tool, the Rorschach has nothing of the crystal ball or of magic in it. It is simply an association test in which each person reacts with his own private associations, and these are classified and interpreted in the same way that a psychiatrist or psychologist interprets any other human phenomena. Its very complexity is an advantage, rather than otherwise. Human nature is complex and cannot be classified in a few simple categories. The Rorschach actually acts as an X-ray, or, perhaps, a mirror. The reflection, however, is in a language which requires special ability to read. The personality is projected into the test; hence, the Rorschach is a projective technique.

Considerable space has been devoted here to the two most important projective techniques because most people are as yet unacquainted with them. Almost no space is given to intelligence tests, and to the I.Q., since these were discussed at length in a previous article in *CHILD STUDY*.^{*} The point of view on the I.Q. expressed there is still valid today. The I.Q. itself, when not thoroughly interpreted by a psychologist, is a useless device. Parents would do well not to push teachers and psychologists into telling them the I.Q.s of their children. Only the composite of abilities and disabilities that go to make up the I.Q. are important, and these cannot properly be put into any figure. The child's educational, vocational, and life potentialities as revealed in the psychological tests are of value for the guidance of the child; the magic number known as the I.Q. is too often misleading by itself.

Another point previously stressed is that the possession of a certain level of intelligence in no way guarantees its use. Social, emotional, physical, and many other factors in addition to intelligence are involved in functioning or in failure to function. Emotional factors, particularly, are neglected in evaluating children's potentialities. Except for mentioning them, no attempt to consider emotional factors can be made in this discussion. The files of this journal are replete with discussions of mental hygiene

problems of children.

Recent years have seen the development of two vicious trends in psychological testing. One of these is the growth of the number of quacks and charlatans in the field. As interest in psychological tests develops, untrained and dishonest testers who call themselves psychologists and who advertise widely take advantage of a gullible public. Being unethical, they will give the public what it wants, regardless of the truth. Thus, every child tested by them is bright, competent, and talented. If a particular child presents a serious problem, they will prescribe methods that may be harmful and aggravate the problem. Some day, psychologists may be licensed by the State, as physicians are, but until then, it is wise to inquire of professional associations, or of organizations like the Child Study Association, before trusting a child to a private psychologist for a fee. The waste of the fee is far less important than the harm to the child.

The second deplorable trend is that of the widespread publication and sale of books and devices called I.Q. Testers, or by similar names. These are supposedly designed to allow parents to act as psychologists for their own children and measure not only their intelligence levels, but their personality and emotional status. To say that these books and tests are not worth the paper they are written on would be a tremendous understatement. They are not only worthless, but are so completely misleading that they may do considerable damage to children if taken seriously by parents. Intelligence and personality testing are complex processes, requiring the highest skill and specialized training. As stated above, even under ideal conditions they leave much to be desired. There is no shortcut to adequate psychological testing. The average psychological test requires years of experimentation, with very large numbers of scientifically selected cases, under special conditions, before it can be considered a scientific psychological test. Psychological tests are never taken on faith by psychologists. In the case of every test used, the competent psychologist will examine the evidence of the standardization process, and what is technically known as the test's "validity and reliability." Even in the case of such a test, selection must be made for special uses and purposes, depending upon the subject to be tested, and be used together with other case history materials. It can readily be seen that using any printed set of tricks or questions does not satisfy the criteria for a psychological test.

* "The Present Status of Intelligence Testing," *CHILD STUDY*, Fall issue, 1941.

NEW LIGHT ON HEREDITY—ADULT ADJUSTMENT OF FOSTER HOME CHILDREN

ANNE ROE

MANY attempts have been made to unravel the influence of heredity and of environment on the final adjustment of the individual. A recent attack on this problem * is based on an investigation of the present adjustment and past history of four groups of adults, all of whom had been brought up by foster parents not related to them. As children, all of these persons had been placed in foster homes by the State Charities Aid Association of New York when, for various reasons, they could no longer remain with their own parents. The four groups comprised children whose parents were known to have certain characteristics. Twenty-five children had normal parents; thirty-six were children who had an alcoholic father (many of these also had mothers who were alcoholic, or promiscuous, and a few of the fathers also had criminal records); eleven children had a psychotic parent and six children had an alcoholic father and a psychotic mother.

These persons are now 22 to 40 years old, averaging 31, so that we are in a position to make some estimate of their adult adjustment to life. The primary problem was to determine any differences in present adjustment among the groups which could be attributed to their parentage. Because they were placed in foster homes of many different sorts, and at different ages, and after differing earlier experiences, it was also possible to study relationships between various environmental factors and how they turned out.

From other studies we knew that if the children of alcoholic parents had remained in their own homes, 20 to 30 per cent of them would probably have become alcoholics and 20 per cent would probably have had nervous disorders. For the children of psychotics similar estimates are not available. One can say only that the incidence of psychosis would be expected to be higher than that in the general population. For New York State it has been estimated that 5 per cent of the general population will at some time be hospitalized for psychosis, and that 10 per cent will at some time be incapacitated by it.

These expectations were conspicuously not fulfilled. There are no alcoholics among these 42 children of alcoholics, and only three of them use alcoholic beverages regularly, as do two of the children of normal

parents. It is true that alcoholism is predominantly a disease of later life and that the average age here is only 31, but from the fact that so few of them are drinking now and that most of them have established adequate personal lives, there is every reason to expect that few, if any, of them ever will become alcoholic. Certainly not as many as 20 to 30 per cent of them will be alcoholics. Aside from alcoholism, there are two children of alcoholic parents whom we regard as seriously maladjusted now as adults, but so are two of the children of normal parents. Not one of the children of psychotic parents was considered seriously maladjusted. It should be added that all of these persons are now beyond the ages at which the common psychosis, schizophrenia, normally appears or is foreshadowed. With one possible exception, there is little likelihood of its development in any of these people. Some of the other psychoses which develop later are less clearly foreshadowed at this age, but again there is no reason to expect any greater incidence than in the general population.

It is worth while emphasizing that some of these children had criminal fathers and a number of them had mothers who were promiscuous. Yet none of the few boys in these groups who did get into serious trouble had criminal fathers, and none of the girls who became sex delinquents, as a few of them did, had own mothers who were promiscuous.

An individual cannot do better than his heredity permits. Because these children of alcoholics and psychotics did, in fact, make such good adjustments, it follows that their heredity was far better than would be inferred from the social and psychological status of their parents. The asocial behavior of these parents was not an indication of genetic inadequacy in their children. The fact that children of alcoholics and psychotics, raised by their own parents, do tend to be seriously maladjusted must, then, be attributed more to the cultural situation than to biological deficiency. The fault is in the environmental relationships rather than in the germ plasm.

The strongest impression that this study leaves is the biological toughness of the human species. It appears that there are no circumstances of life, either in infancy or later, which make it impossible for a person to develop an adjustment which is adequate for him and for society. We had some evidence that children who lacked any experience of love and

* *Adult Adjustment of Foster Children of Alcoholic and Psychotic Parentage and the Influence of the Foster Home. Memoirs of the Section on Alcohol Studies, Yale University, No. 3. Anne Roe and Barbara Burka. 1945. New Haven.*

warmth as children did not develop very warm and close personal relations as adults, but nevertheless were able to fit into the general social pattern and develop personal relations on a level apparently satisfactory to them and others.

The infancy and early childhood of these foster children in many instances violated most of the standards set by our society and lacked most, if not all, of those personal experiences generally held to be essential to the foundations of adequate personality. In addition, a number of the foster homes in which these children were placed were not good homes in the sense of giving a child loving care and approval and understanding. But they were socially respected homes, and this was important.

At the present time a few of these children are very well adjusted, secure and happy, and satisfied with their lives; a few are seriously maladjusted (but by no means psychotic); the others are at various levels between these extremes. A little over a third of them show some evidence of maladjustment. It is hard to say how this contrasts with the population at large. Are a third of our adult population somewhat maladjusted by the criteria we used? Probably so.*

An extensive and careful search was made for any factors that might be associated with adjustment or maladjustment. This was not very revealing, but some trends did appear. Childhood experience of love from the foster parents showed a significant association with present good adjustment, when the attitude of both parents was considered. The association was not significant for either parent alone. There seemed, too, to be an association between leniency of childhood discipline † and present feelings of security. It also seemed that children brought up in homes in which there were personality problems in the adults find normal relations with other persons difficult now, and are inclined to have difficulties in facing reality.

In short, if parents are themselves well adjusted, and are affectionate and lenient with their children, this does not guarantee that their children will be happy and well adjusted, but it does mean that these children will have a much better chance of achieving a good adjustment. Furthermore, it is clear that parents receive affection as richly as they give it, and generally more rather than less than they deserve.

It is clear, too, that very often the parent who professed to love a child, but who criticized the child's friends, his leisure time activities, and disapproved of his behavior generally, was basically a rejecting par-

ent, but this rejection very often seemed to have nothing to do with inadequacy in the child's personality.

The foster children were often reluctant to criticize their foster parents, but we found one question very revealing. It was a question as to what things they would do differently in bringing up their own children. It is a question we might profitably ask our own children, if they can be honest with us.

We are still left, however, with the problem of how it happened that some of these children did turn out so well. Consider, for instance, the record of two sisters. Their father was an alcoholic, their mother psychotic (paranoid dementia praecox). Their early years were sagas of neglect and abuse. They were placed in a foster home in which the father was kindly but ineffective and the mother certainly psychopathic if not psychotic. In spite of a very difficult time, they succeeded, largely by their own efforts and in the face of their foster mother's violent opposition, in getting good educations. Both also got and kept good jobs, and are now married and apparently quite well adjusted, even though both have some minor disorders which are probably psychosomatic. How was it possible?

* We rated present level of personality adjustment on a five-point scale.

† Very well adjusted: Meets life situations with enthusiasm and competence, or if problems are especially difficult, with unusual adequacy. No recent outstanding maladjustments of temperament, nor large infractions against the social mores.

a. Well adjusted: Meets life situations positively and with fair success, or if problems are especially difficult, "as well as could be expected." No recent outstanding maladjustments of temperament, nor large infractions against the social mores.

b. Fairly satisfactory adjustments: Not outstandingly positive; is "getting along." No recent outstanding maladjustments of temperament, nor large infractions against the social mores.

c. Somewhat maladjusted, shown by: a. Behavior: partial failure to discharge normal obligations; overaggressive, overdependent, self-centered, withdrawn, or escape behavior; occasional violations of social mores (e.g., drinking that interferes with normal obligations, minor delinquencies). b. Emotional or temperamental difficulties: chronic anxieties; depressions; overexcitability; unhealthy attachments or other difficulties.

d. Seriously maladjusted, shown by: a. Behavior resulting in gross social liability; failure to discharge normal obligations; overaggressive, overdependent, self-centered, withdrawn or escape behavior to extreme degree; serious violations of social mores (e.g., chronic alcoholism, crime), or other maladjusted behavior. b. Emotional or temperamental difficulties making custodial care necessary or possibly advisable.

† Our rating code for parents' discipline of Subject as a child was as follows. (Parents were rated jointly. Rating 8 may be given in addition to any of the others.)

1. Harsh and extremely frequent punishment.

2. Rigid discipline, enforced by punishment.

3. Reasonable disciplinary régime, punishment rare or only resorted to when reasoning failed.

4. General laissez-faire attitude. Little discipline and little or no punishment.

5. Parent placated Subject. Subject "ruled the roost."

6. Punishment harsh at one period and lax at another.

7. Extreme inconsistency. Subject never knew what to expect.

8. Disparity in attitude of parents, where great enough that the child attempts to make use of it.

The last three ratings were so rarely given that they did not enter into the statistical analysis; for this, ratings 7 and 8 were grouped together as strict discipline, and ratings 4 and 5 (5 was given only once) as lenient discipline. In this analysis there were 21 children who received strict, 19 reasonable, and 29 lenient discipline.

(Continued on page 128)

A Mother Contributors

Emotional factors continuously influence a child's ability to learn. A good psychologist knows this and is wary of making positive predictions purely on the basis of a child's "score" in testing. In the following letter one mother tells a personal experience which came near to being disastrous.

—THE EDITORS.

A DRASTIC reversal in the results of an intelligence test in my own family makes me want to share this information with other parents. On the whole, we must, I feel, agree that intelligence tests have real value. But parents should know, too, that the most valid results are obtained with school-age rather than with very young children. Even more important, we should all know that emotional factors often influence the "score" which a child achieves.

My son was two years old but did not yet talk. Perhaps his vocalizing had word meanings to him but it still could not honestly have been called words. It was all dramatic sound effects. He didn't really talk. Since most children at two years old are pretty well launched into speech, I, like so many mothers, was a bit worried about it. At the same time, I had many reasons to believe that our boy was a bright enough child. Having studied just enough psychology to believe in the reliability of intelligence tests, I took what seemed the obvious step to prove to myself and all questioning observers just what was what with our son. I called in a psychologist of excellent reputation.

Our small son was tested according to the methods most approved for the pre-school child. The psychologist arrived at our home. My husband and I were permitted to remain on the scene of the test, and watched our boy experience the joy that comes from having both mother and father and a guest all paying sole attention to him. He was very charming and gay throughout the performance but he tested borderline, something, that is, between a moron and dull normal. The general summation of all the tests gave him an I.Q. of between 75 and 80 which to us made a grim picture of what he had ahead of him for life.

I was despondent. At the same time, however, I was consumed by a desire to prove that this test was all wrong, and that in some way or other the picture

of the child as a whole had not been considered nor had the responses been correctly evaluated.

For here perhaps lies the story of why he was still an emotionally upset child from many angles, and why he was functioning poorly. He had been our boy for only one year out of his two years of life. He had come from a foster home where heaven only knows what emotional deprivations he had undergone. We knew only that when he came to us he was desperately demanding of love and attention and that this demand continued unabated as though he were still not sure that our love and attention were his for keeps. The psychologist, however, did not regard these facts as important. She believed that the I.Q. as found probably represented his true and permanent limits of development. In spite of the fact that she did recommend retesting in a few months, it was clear from my conversations with her that she did not really expect much change for the better. She even went so far as to recommend strongly to us and to the agency by letter that this child was not "material for adoption" and that he might be better off in an institution. She seemed quite certain and gave us no hope for further development in the child, suggesting that one year in a good home should have overcome all possible early handicaps. I could not agree with her. I knew in my heart she was wrong, but here was black and white evidence from a very skilled and experienced person.

I decided then to get another psychologist, also well recommended and expert. This test yielded only slightly higher results. The situation still looked grim to us. There was a difference in conclusions, however, drawn by these psychologists in that the second one recommended the adoption to go on as planned, predicting that after speech came a more conclusive test could be taken. He pointed out also that a child with even this low intelligence could certainly find a normal place in a world such as ours where people who can perform the routine mechanical skills are needed and are fairly well rewarded.

Well, we did adopt him, because he was ours and, moron or not, we loved him and couldn't possibly give him up. I waited patiently, and then when he was five, and talking fluently, I again had him tested. Lo and behold! There emerged an altogether different verdict. He tested high, good

(Continued on page 126)

Book Review

Democratic Education in Practice. By Rose Schneideman. Harper & Bros., 1945. \$3.00.

Teachers all over the country are unquestionably reading this book. I hope that parents will also read it, for it registers a milestone in education. It represents one of the first attempts to apply modern principles of education to the public elementary school in thorough-going and practical fashion. And this is an inevitable next step in the field. There will, I hope, always be experimentation in education, and this must be carried on in small, and probably private, schools. But a chapter is finished. Certain theories have passed the acid test of practice—have been proved to work. If democracy is to become a reality in our schools, we must extend the benefits of this knowledge beyond the few and the privileged, to the many and the less privileged. It is inspiring that a public school teacher of many years standing, and one previously addicted to traditional methods should feel this so strongly and be one of the first to express it so concretely.

Miss Schneideman sets forth her position early in the book. She believes the goal of education is not to inculcate facts, but to develop citizens. "If the work appears to suffer," she says, "the teacher will do well to list other gains in behavior and progress in independent thinking. These will compensate for any loss in factual knowledge. If there has been even the slightest amount of improvement in qualities of citizenship, then the teacher may survey the results with justifiable pride."

Miss Schneideman also tells us how the goal is to be attained—through experience programs, through integration of school activities in a curriculum enriched by such activities as painting, arts and crafts, shop work, dramatics, and excursions. She believes democracy must be learned through democratic living; she holds that children can only achieve a sense of responsibility by being given responsibility. Miss Schneideman believes teachers must view children as human beings, as individuals, and that they must take into account the kinds of homes from which their pupils come. She stresses the importance of an emotional climate of warmth, and of an encouraging and understanding attitude.

And best of all, Miss Schneideman shows exactly how to apply these principles; how to apply them in

the large classroom and in relation to every subject of study. The physical arrangement of the classroom, how to organize the class into groups, how to teach the three R's, also history and geography, how to stimulate creative art expression, how to relate various activities to a central theme, how to get started and how to carry forward—these and many more questions are specifically answered in the book. This is the kind of material for which teachers have been hungering for many years.

No book is perfect. Those whose authors are pioneers labor under certain peculiar handicaps. To me the greatest limitation of this volume is the fact that, while the writer advocates new principles, she sometimes carries them out in traditional ways. As a result, we have, at certain times a serious contradiction between theory and practice. Thus, while Miss Schneideman recognizes the importance of interest in learning, she advocates bestowing of gold stars as rewards of merit. While she holds that the pupils' art work can only be judged in the light of their individual development, she urges holding competitions as a means of encouraging creative expression. On one page of the book she contends that traits of character must develop through actual living; on another she states that these are to be instilled—and for their own sakes. In organizing the class into groups she warns teachers to separate children who are friends, thus registering the traditional teacher's fear of the school age child's normal urge to seek security through close association with his peers. This procedure fails to use this impulse constructively. Modern principles of education and of psychology have been more successfully applied to the public school than this. Unfortunately, however, those who have so applied them have not often seen fit to express themselves in print. These limitations, however, do not mean that the book will not be of enormous help to many teachers.

AGNES E. BENEDICT

ANY
BOOK

Any book advertised, reviewed, or mentioned in "Child Study" may be ordered by mail from
BAKER-ALEXANDER CO.
1472 B'way, N. Y. C. 18
Books sent post free on prepaid orders

Children's Books

NATURE AND SCIENCE

Spring Comes to Meadow Brook Farm. Written and illustrated by Katherine Southwick Keeler. Thomas Nelson. 1945. \$2.50. 40 pp.

This is a simple story with homely details and pleasant illustrations of the stirring of spring among the animals on a farm. (7-9)

Animals Here and There. Illustrated by Pelagie Doane. Garden City. 1945. \$.50.

Here is a pleasant book of animals, familiar to children, found on the farm, in the city, in the meadow, by the brook and in the woods. The slight text tells how they live. Children will enjoy the brightly colored illustrations. (7-9)

The Story of "Gertie." Rinehart. 1946. \$1.00. 40 pp.

News photographers and scientists here report the day-to-day story of Gertie, the wild mallard, as she raised her family of ducklings on the Wisconsin Avenue bridge in Milwaukee under the watchful eyes of thousands of people. Excellent photographs. (7-9)

What Bird Is It? Written and illustrated by Anna Pistorius. Wilcox & Follett. 1945. \$1.00.

Not many children can distinguish one bird from another. This little book with bright illustrations of birds describes the habits, life, calls and behavior of twenty-three of our most familiar birds. An excellent aid to identification for young children. (7-10)

Splasher. By Alice Gall and Fleming Crew. Illustrated by Else Bostelmann. Oxford. 1945. \$2.00. 136 pp.

Washed out of their burrows by a flood, Old Muskrat and young Splasher find themselves going on a trip up the river. Into their various adventures is skilfully woven a picture of the life of these river-bank animals. (8-10)

Meeny, Meeny, Miney, Mo—and Still-Mo. By Sam Campbell. Illustrated by Will Forrest. Bobbs-Merrill. 1945. \$2.00. 238 pp.

This is a heart-warming account of the antics of five frisky squirrels and the small animals of the American North Woods, and of how they brought comfort to a young soldier and helped him to reaffirm his faith. Despite its juvenile appearance, its appeal will be to the more mature. (12 and over)

Jungle Animals. By Frank Buck. Written with Ferrin Fraser. Illustrated by Roger Vernam. Random House. 1945. \$1.25. 56 pp.

The young reader will follow the author with deep absorption while he travels and lives in the jungle countries of the world. The brief sketches of the exotic and familiar animals, their lives and habits, are lively and exciting, and both the stories and illustrations will give the children a deeper understanding of animal life in the jungle. (10-14)

The Woodland Book. By Elmer Ransom. Illustrated by Sabra Mallett. Howell, Soskin. 1945. \$3.00. 110 pp.

For mature readers and sportsmen with a special interest in the creatures of woods and fields, this is a series of informal sketches of some of our best-known birds and animals. (14 and over)

Life Through the Ages. Written and illustrated by Charles R. Knight. Knopf. 1946. \$2.00. 68 pp.

Prehistoric animals and their descendants are brought alive in vivid, well-written text and pencil drawings in this fascinating panorama of the development of animals through the ages. (12 and over)

Let's Find Out. By Nina and Herman Schneider. Illustrated by Jeanne Bendick. Scott. 1946. \$1.25. 40 pp.

Every inquiring child will welcome this simple and inviting picture book of science. Clearly illustrated and right with the text are directions for experiments with heat, air, water, etc., using easy-to-get equipment to be found around the house. (7-11)

Egg to Chick. By Millicent E. Selsam. Illustrated by Frances Wells. Young World Books. 1946. \$1.00.

The Egg—with the turning of each page—inevitably becomes the Chick, in this first science book, meanwhile helping the child to understand something of the background of all animal growth. The illustrations are clear and helpful. (8-10)

An Open Door to Chemistry. By John L. Horning and George C. McGinnis. Illustrations by Helen Armstrong. Appleton-Century. 1946. \$2.00. 86 pp.

The child with a special interest in chemistry will find here a bridge to more technical material, with diagrams and detailed experiments for use at home. (12 and over)

Oceans in the Sky. By Vera Edelstadt. Illustrated by Louis Bunin. Knopf. 1946. \$1.75.

The function and importance of water presented in vivid imaginative prose. Striking illustrations. (10-14)

Basketful: The Story of Our Foods. By Irmengarde Eberle. Illustrated by Marion R. Kohs. Crowell. 1946. \$2.00. 256 pp.

A point of view no less than an aid to research, this is an invaluable presentation of the sources of our foods, their cultivation, and the effects of their development upon mankind. (10-14)

The Land Renewed: The Story of Soil Conservation. By William R. VanDersal and Edward H. Graham. Oxford. 1946. \$2.00. 110 pp.

Here is an exciting and dramatic picture of how we can renew the fertility and usefulness of billions of acres of

(Continued on page 124)

Children's Radio Programs

Institute for Education by Radio

"RADIO'S Postwar Responsibilities" was the subject of discussion at the Annual Institute for Education by Radio held at Columbus, Ohio, May 3rd to 6th. Two work-study meetings were devoted to children's programs. At the first day's session "Network Programs and Problems" were discussed by a panel including representatives of the four major networks, a sponsor and an advertising agency executive; a children's script writer, an educator, and a psychiatrist. Discussion was focused on children's interests and listening preferences, and the techniques by which the industry and producers try to meet these interests. The concern of parents and teachers with the problem of overstimulation and tension in children's radio listening was stressed, and the importance of safeguarding children's emotional and health needs. There was considerable discussion of the place of educational material in after-school and entertainment programs.

The second day's session on "Local Programs—New and Experimental" highlighted the successful programming currently being done throughout the country, presenting a varied fare of children's programs including story-telling, youth forums, teen-age programs, dramatized selections from literature and nature programs. Some of these programs have already proved their popularity over a long period, others are still experimental. There was discussion, too, of developments in the use of in-school programs, and the promising experimentation that is going on in television. The function of the university workshop in developing script writers and perfecting broadcasting techniques was also discussed with emphasis on the need for greater attention to the writing and production of programs for children.

At a luncheon meeting following these sessions the use of children's programs for developing good social attitudes—especially their value in combatting racial and religious intolerance—was debated. Speakers at the luncheon were Willard S. Johnson, vice-president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and Dr. S. Harcourt Peppard, Acting Director of the Bureau of Child Guidance, New York City Board of Education. Representatives of many educational and intercultural organizations, as well as specialists in radio, participated in the discussion.

A full report of the work-study sessions on children's programs will be included in the Ohio State University's published proceedings of the Institute.

The annual award of the Institute for the best children's program was given to the *House of Mystery* (MBS). This is the first time this award has gone to a sponsored program. In its citation the Award Committee said: "This program achieves the objectives essential in a program for children. First and foremost, it entertains; second, it is good radio drama; third, the suspense is resolved within the program; fourth, it shows that superstition and fear are based on ignorance. . . . It is a new type of program which may encourage and stimulate those in radio who are constantly seeking new approaches to children's programs." Honorable mention for the award was also given to *The Story of America* and *The March of Science* (CBS), both American School of the Air productions. "These programs," the Committee pointed out, "do an effective job for children in two important areas not similarly treated elsewhere."

JOSETTE FRANK

CHILDREN'S BOOKS

(Continued from page 123)

our land through soil conservation farming. Excellent photographs illuminate the text. (12 and over)

Volcanoes New and Old. By Satis N. Coleman. John Day. 1946. \$3.75. 222 pp.

An eyewitness of the eruption of Paricutin in southwest Mexico tells its exciting story together with the background of volcanic activity and vignettes of volcanoes the world over. (12 and over)

Flowing Gold: The Romance of Oil. By John J. Floberg. Lippincott. 1945. \$2.50. 256 pp.

Oil—how it is pumped, refined transported by pipeline, tanker or railroad, and converted into gasoline and hundreds of other products—makes a fascinating story with numerous photographs. (12 and over)

Rayon, Nylon and Glass Fibers. By the WPA Pennsylvania Writers' Project. Albert Whitman. 1945. \$.50. 48 pp.

In large type, this book, one of a valuable series, explains clearly and simply the origin, manufacturing process and uses of these fabrics. (9-12)

BETTY P. CARB
LOVA ABRAHAMSEN

News and Notes

Play Schools Association A new pamphlet, "Ways and Means of Reaching Parents," by Jean Schick Grossman (price, 15 cents), has been issued by the Play Schools Association, 119 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y. It is addressed to teachers, parents, and group leaders.

A new film, "Play Is Our Business," produced under the technical supervision of the Playschools Association, and with Dr. Alice V. Keliher of New York University as consultant, is now available. It shows how a community goes about its job of organizing play-work programs for after-school hours and during vacation. The State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs has selected this film for world-wide distribution, translated into twenty languages. The film is available for purchase at \$45, rental price \$3. It is distributed by Sun Dial Films, Inc., 625 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Arts in Childhood A new series of bulletins, ARTS IN CHILDHOOD, has appeared this year. The bulletins contain articles on arts and crafts, music and drama, language arts, and social studies. They are directed primarily to elementary school teachers. Next year's series will devote more attention to what can be done in the home in this area. ARTS IN CHILDHOOD is published at 58 Park Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. Subscription rate is \$1 for a series of five, 25 cents each copy.

Radio Forums "The Influence of Radio, Motion Pictures and Comics on Children" was discussed from many points of view in a series of three forums broadcast on the Mutual network in April. Austin MacCormick was moderator for all three broadcasts. Discussants on the subject of radio programs were Josette Frank, Raphael Hayes, William F. Soskin, S. Harcourt Peppard and Judge Jacob Panken; on motion pictures, Alice V. Keliher, Eileen Creelman, Paul S. Heard and Edwin J. Lukas; on comics, Ernest G. Osborne, Mrs. Frances Clarke Sayers, Lauretta Bender and William Ward Ayer.

A complete transcript of the three broadcasts may be obtained from the Mutual Broadcasting Company, 1440 Broadway, New York City.

National Institute of Social Relations

A series of discussion guides called "Talk It Over," designed for use by group discussion leaders, is being published by the National Institute of Social Relations, Inc., with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

Subject matter of the "Talk It Over" series varies widely, including Youth Problems, Veterans, Women, Labor, Housing, Health, Unemployment, Discrimination, Education Propaganda, Community Planning, Atomic Energy and other national and international problems.

The Institute's Board of Consultants includes Manchester Boddy, Mrs. J. B. Calkins, Col. Evans F. Carlson, Everett R. Clinchy, Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, Donald Dushane, Frank B. Graham, Mordecai W. Johnson, Katharine Lenroot, Brig. General William Menninger, Philip Murray, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Quentin Reynolds, Channing H. Tobias, George S. Stevenson, Walter F. Wanger and Frank L. Weil.

Single copies of the discussion guides are five cents, 25 copies \$1.00, and 100 copies \$3.50.

Additional information may be obtained from the national office at 1029 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

National Parent Education Conference

The first post-war Parent Education Conference, held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, on May 2-4, 1946, brought together 125 parent education leaders from many parts of the country. The conference was sponsored by the Parent Education Clearing House, maintained by *Parents' Magazine*. The National Council on Parent Education held a meeting of its members during the conference sessions. Several of the present and former members of the governing board of the National Council of Parent Education are members of the Advisory Board of the Clearing House.

Typical of the talks given at the conference is the one by Dr. James S. Plant, director of the Essex County Juvenile Clinic, Newark, New Jersey. Dr. Plant said:

"The most important need is that as we who are interested in parent education set up our goals, we keep from the pitfalls into which ordinary education

(Continued on page 128)

RIVALRY IN SCHOOL

(Continued from page 109)

same people. Adults must not react so violently to these situations that they cannot function wisely.

Sometimes the adult need do nothing. Judy and Carol settled their feelings themselves. Any adult interference would have lifted the event out of its place and weighted it unduly. It happened, was handled by the children, and then was over. This did not mean that Judy would never have a similar experience. There would probably be many of them. The child whose mother lets her help in putting the baby back in the crib will come through better than the child who is angrily told that she is lying and a bad, hateful, naughty girl. Evelyn and Josie went to see the pigs. Later on the teacher took both of them together and had a serious talk in which all three shared, about how important it is to understand that people pray differently, and that each person has her right to her own way of praying. The two little girls went off with their arms about each other, having come far along the way that leads to understanding between peoples of different races and different faiths.

Where rivalries between boys and girls are concerned, schools and families are up against a cultural pattern. There are inherited traditions which play their strong part in determining the rôles of boys and girls in relationship to each other and to groups. The school which has a fine program of athletics for the boys and nothing for the girls, which always elects a boy as president and a girl as secretary, which feels a college education is more important for boys than for girls, is creating rivalry problems which are far-reaching. To handle the girl and boy hostilities and enthusiasms takes experience and training and wisdom. It requires great compassion for these young people as they work out their destinies in human relationships with each other, with adults, with their families, with their communities.

A school principal announced in the morning assembly, "There will be no more stealing in this school. I have forbidden it." The stealing, however, continued. One cannot handle the problems of rivalry in such manner, either. Forbidding or scolding or humiliating or indulging or placating or being shocked are all futile. One faces these issues fairly, knows them in truth and in fact for what they really are, and one welcomes the opportunity to help these young children to work their way out. But to succeed in helping, the adult must be able to face

issues without blame, to accept the child's feelings as valid, to have an infinite respect for the needs of the child, and to believe that as one helps children to handle their feelings of rivalry and jealousy one is helping them to feel safe in the world.

A MOTHER CONTRIBUTES

(Continued from page 121)

"college material," said the psychologist. She also made another recommendation. This was to test him again in four or five more years, for she believed he might possibly test even higher. This psychologist detected that he was still not as emotionally balanced as a five-year-old should be and hoped that as he gained more and more inner security his native faculties would gain fuller release.

Now this child, our adopted son, is flourishing. He is a dynamo of vital energy and constructive imagination and certainly no tests are needed to prove his adequate brain power. He leads his grade at school and particularly has a flair for reading. His vocabulary was shown, after it finally came, to be very large and discriminating.

I have no doubt but that the best psychologists have always realized that anyone who administers psychometric tests should have trained powers of perception to determine just when emotions, for one thing, may be blocking mental development. I hope that psychologists without such insight who read this will feel a real prick of conscience if they have made final judgments on any child's intelligence without carefully considering his emotional life simultaneously. I feel a great thankfulness now that the second two psychologists did see the possibilities for higher achievements in a child whose emotional development constituted a handicap, but a handicap which need not last all his life and which is, in fact, in our son's case, gradually being overcome.

So here's to tests, but by discriminating testers! It's not that I doubt their usefulness. But it does seem to me imperative that they should be administered only by those who have this deeper understanding which I have discussed. We all want our children's capabilities fulfilled to their maximum. We want to help to extend those of the gifted and learn to relax our demands with less capable children. If intelligence tests can truly help us do this, it will mean a richer, happier, and more useful life for everyone concerned.

JEALOUSY AND RIVALRY BETWEEN BROTHERS AND SISTERS

(Continued from page 105)

insecure and too self-absorbed.

What had happened in this girl's life to make her so unsuccessful and unhappy? Her mother had cared for her until her brother, Robert, was born, when Ruth was a little past three. Almost at once the mother turned her entire attention to the boy. When Ruth developed tantrums the mother said she could not stand such misbehavior and trundled her off to an aunt for the summer. In a few months Ruth got over the tantrums, but became shy and very demanding of attention. She got along fairly well in school, though without real interest, and as early as six or seven she began to devote much time to clothes and details of her appearance.

As the children grew older the mother increased her attention to Robert and spoke often about how fine it was to have a son. Ruth used to long to be a boy so that her mother would love her, too. Her jealousy of her brother became intense as did her eagerness for attention.

Because Ruth could not compete with her brother she believed herself incapable of competing with anyone. Yet she yearned to be made much of. She thought people might like her if only her looks could be different, and that her hair, her nose, her style of dress must be wrong. Knowing little of love, she decided popularity was the answer to her longings. Popularity, popularity, popularity—she could think of nothing else.

This case, too, illustrates some of the causes of abnormal jealousy and its results. The mother was too absorbed in the new baby, misunderstood the girl's temper tantrums and rejected her, emphasized the importance of masculinity over femininity and devoted herself almost exclusively to her son. Thus jealousy was stimulated in the girl. This jealousy resulted in unfavorable character traits—shallowness, lack of interest, inability to love and preoccupation with looks and popularity.

Although jealousy is universal and rivalry necessary for success in life, intense jealousy leads to character deformation. The early relationships of brothers and sisters to each other and to their parents determine all later relationships. If you can understand the rôle that jealousy plays in the lives of your children you may be able to limit its intensity and to direct its expression.

THE N. Y. TIMES SAYS:

"For its practical help...it cannot be overpraised"

Infant and Child



IN THE CULTURE OF TODAY

The Guidance of Development in Home and Nursery School

By ARNOLD GESELL, M.D., Director of the Clinic of Child Development, School of Medicine, Yale University, and FRANCES L. ILG, M.D., Assistant Professor of Child Development in the Guidance Nursery, and LOUIS B. AMES, Ph.D., Research Assistant.

"**S**O FAR as this reviewer knows, there is nothing like this book in print. For its practical help to parents, teachers, and anyone connected with the very young, it cannot be overpraised. In a series of detailed 'Behavior Profiles' and 'Behavior Days,' the authors illustrate typical growth trends, and the traits accompanying them, from the time the baby gets his eyes in focus until he becomes a self-reliant small citizen, aged 5." —Catherine Mackenzie, *N. Y. Times Book Review*

CONTENTS

- I. GROWTH AND CULTURE. The Family in a Democratic Culture How the Mind Grows—Infants Are Individuals—Self-Regulation and Cultural Guidance—The Cycle of Child Development.
- II. THE GROWING CHILD. Before the Baby Is Born—A Good Start Four Weeks Old—Sixteen Weeks Old—Twenty-eight Weeks Old—Forty Weeks Old—One Year Old—Fifteen Months Old—Eighteen Months Old—Two Years Old—Two-and-a-half Years Old
- III. THE GUIDANCE OF GROWTH. A Developmental Philosophy—The Growth Complex—Child Development and the Culture of Tomorrow.
- IV. APPENDIX. Behavior Day Chart for Self-Regulation Scheduling—Toys, Play Materials, and Equipment—Books—Musical Records—Selected Readings.

17th Printing
At all bookstores, or use the coupon below

→ READ IT FOR 10 DAYS
Simply fill in the coupon and mail it now

FREE

HARPER & BROTHERS, Mail Order Division,
637 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Please send me INFANT AND CHILD IN THE CULTURE OF TODAY. At the end of ten days I will remit \$4.00 plus a few cents mailing charges in full payment or return the book. Check here if you enclose \$4.00 in which case we pay mailing charges. Same return privilege.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____

5501E

NEWS AND NOTES

(Continued from page 125)

has so tragically fallen. There are five areas of importance here.

1. We must clearly remain at the level of 'life motivation'—that is, our education must be in terms of people living together instead of in terms of the manipulation of symbols. It must be in terms of what people mean to each other, and we must see more clearly than the schools have that *doing* must always be measured against what life and living with people *means*.

2. Let's be the first ones to show our faith in 'readiness.' The schools know that a person cannot learn anything until he is ready to learn it. But they don't practice this. I would hope that instead of anything like a curriculum we would build solidly into all of our approach the most sensitive sort of mechanism of recognition as to when a parent is ready for this or that sort of help or information.

3. The creation of faith in parents that they can do a good job is our constant concern.

4. In the field of parent education, the so-called 'psycho-motor tensions,' the way we walk and talk, is the language of our field.

5. We must also follow a scientific method which understands that everything is built upon an hypothesis. This emphasis upon setting up a framework of 'those things which we accept without the need of proof' is of primary importance."

Education for Democracy COMMUNITY SCHOOL

196 New York Ave., Brooklyn • President 2-0196
• Non-profit, progressive school for boys and girls. Enriched curriculum, experienced teachers. Pre-kindergarten thru eighth grade. We help arrange transportation. Spacious, fireproof building; ample indoor and outdoor play space. Annual tuition (including hot lunches)—pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, \$425; regular grades, \$475. Write for Illustrated Catalog C.

ELEANOR W. FOSTER, Director

A Picture Story of Your Child

Refreshingly natural photographs of your youngster, taken either at your home or at the Studio.



Kay Simmon
PHOTOGRAPHER OF LITTLE PEOPLE
47 WEST 44TH STREET • NEW YORK
Murray Hill 2-0654

THE QUEENS SCHOOL

The new progressive school in Queens

Chartered, accredited, non-profit parent-teacher cooperative. Educational stress on emotional, intellectual and social development. Openings for children 6 through 9.

Director, Miss REBECCA COFFIN

formerly of *The Lincoln School*

137th St. and 77th Ave., Kew Gardens Hills, Flushing, L.I.
BO 3-3469

Jane Mayer
teacher of piano
with special attention to children who
are "hard to teach" or "hate practicing"
Music is Fun and a Challenge

1040 Park Avenue, New York • AT 9-5361

NEW LIGHT ON HEREDITY

(Continued from page 120)

There seem to be two things which play much larger parts in life adjustment than we have generally given them credit for. There must be an essential character of the human organism which can be described as a drive toward integration which is biological, and which functions in the spheres of emotional and social life as it does on the physical level. It must be, too, that acceptance of the child as a member of the community (an acceptance automatically extended to the members of respected families, and generally withheld from the members of such families as many of these children were born into) makes it possible for him to construct an ideal of himself which can function as an integrating force. To be a recognized member of a group, to know one's place, is a basic element in a feeling of security. It is conceivable also that the basic assumption of our society, the assumption of the dignity and worth of the individual, is sufficiently pervasive that it may offer support even to the child whose dignity suffers attack from his parents. These, together with such good elements as even the poorest heredity must include, are perhaps the answer.